

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 17-21, 23 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,400,020 ("Jones"). Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,819,191 ("Scully"). Claims 1-9, 12-16, 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Jones. Claims 10-11 and 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of Jones and U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974 ("Tognazzini").

No claims have been added, deleted, amended or canceled. Thus, claims 1-33 are pending.

B. The Claims are Neither Anticipated Nor Rendered Obvious by the Cited References

Each of independent claims 1, 16-19 and 29-32 contain at least one element not disclosed by any of the cited references, considered either alone or in combination. Each of these independent claims recites the element of receiving a response to the attendee notification message from an attendee. As stated at page 8, lines 14-21 of the present application, embodiments of the present invention allow responses back from attendees of a meeting to the attendee notification message. This feature allows great flexibility of the scheduling system, e.g., attendees are rendered capable of canceling or rescheduling meetings. None of the cited references, considered alone or in combination with the other cited references, suggests or discloses this element. Moreover, this element, which allows embodiments of the present invention great flexibility compared to known scheduling systems, is not obvious in light of any of the cited references, nor obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of filing of the present application. Additionally, claims 16, 18-19 and 29 (as well as dependent claim 14) also state that

the response received back from an attendee changes information about the appointment. This feature is also not suggested or disclosed by any of the cited references, or known to those skilled in the art. Therefore, the independent claims are neither anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), nor rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the cited references, and should be allowed.

The Office Action stated that the feature of “receiving a response to the attendee notification message from an attendee” is shown by Jones on col. 6, lines 59-68 and Figure 4. However, as agreed by the Examiner during the Interview, this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Jones. Moreover, this feature is not suggested or disclosed by any of the other cited references.

Dependent claims 2-15, 20-28 and 33 each depend from one of claims 1, 16-19 and 29-32, which have been shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2-15, 20-28 and 33 should also be allowed.

C. Art Should be Cited for Official Notice Taken

In the office action, the Examiner took official notice for the propositions that it is old and well known that:

- replacing the telephone with e-mail messages for notification would provide another means of communication in a scheduling system;
- a scheduling unit as disclosed in the present application would be coupled to the schedule database;
- location information is calculated from an automatic identification number in a scheduling system;
- adjusting travel velocity based on weather information, for purposes of determining, in the scheduling system, whether the user will be late for the appointment;

- adjusting travel velocity based on airline information, for purposes of determining, in the scheduling system, whether the user will be late for the appointment.

The Applicants traverse these assertions based on the fact that none of these propositions in connection with scheduling systems was known to those skilled in the art *at the time of filing of the present application*. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to cite references in the prior art for these propositions.

D. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing remarks demonstrate that the application is in condition for allowance and notification to this effect is hereby solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is authorized to charge any fees associated with this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: December 20, 2000

By:



Sinan Utku, (Registration No. 46,137)

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201